
PARTICIPATE

PARTICIPATE was founded in 1984 to strengthen public access cable television in New York State through public information about it.

In 1985-86, we conducted a comprehensive survey of cable systems in the state, along with institutions we saw as potential cable users: libraries, colleges and universities, public schools, media centers and local arts councils. In 1986, we conducted two major conferences about public access in Buffalo-Western New York and Albany-Troy-Rensselaer. We showed videotape compilations edited from survey respondents at conferences and meetings in 1986-1988 to introduce the state's access programming to new audiences.

In 1987, we published updated listings in **PARTICIPATE's Directory of Public Access Cable Channels and Related Video Resources** (available from the Alternative Media Information Center, 121 Fulton Street, New York, NY 10038).

This report is the final result of our survey.

Notes About the Authors

Diana Agosta is a writer, teacher, and producer of community-based media. She edited **MEDIAC-TIVE**, Media Network's magazine on the use of social issue media. She teaches documentary production at Downtown Community Television in New York City.

Abigail Norman works as Access Coordinator at Somerville Community Access Television, in Somerville, Massachusetts.

Caryn Rogoff has recently been Programming Coordinator of Deep Dish TV. She is Director of Program Development at Staten Island Community Access Television.

2

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of

Implementation of Section 10 of
the Cable Consumer Protection
and Competition Act of 1992

Indecent Programming and Other
Types of Materials on Cable Access
Channels

MM Docket No. 92-258

AFFIDAVIT OF PATRICIA AUFDERHEIDE

Patricia Aufderheide, being duly sworn, deposes and says as follows:

1. I am an assistant professor in the School of Communication at the American University of Washington, D.C.

2. I am preparing a scholarly article for presentation to the International Communications Association, the tentative name of which is "Public Access Cable Programming, Controversial Speech and Free Expression." A draft of this article is attached to this affidavit.


3. Since the passage of the Cable Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, Pub. L. 102-385, and in preparation for this article, I have been conducting a survey of directors of public access centers across the country. This survey is intended to collect respondents' perceptions as to the likely effects that will result from that Act's introduction of editorial control by cable operators over access programming.

4. As part of this survey, I have mailed questionnaires to the access directors on the mailing list of the Alliance for Community Media. To date, thirty access directors have responded.

5. Also as part of my survey, I have to date interviewed thirty-one access directors by telephone.

6. The results of my survey are reported as part of the draft article that is attached to this declaration.

Executed on the 4th day of December, 1992.



Patricia Aufderheide

District of Columbia, ss:

Sworn and subscribed before me this 4th day of December, 1992.

My commission expires Nov. 14, 1996.



Notary Public

Debbie R. Best
Not. District of Columbia
Exp. Expires Nov. 14, 1996



**Public Access Cable Programming,
Controversial Speech,
and Free Expression**

by Patricia Aufderheide

December 1992

**Patricia Aufderheide is an assistant professor in the School of Communication
at The American University.**

c copyright 1992 Patricia Aufderheide

School of Communication

4400 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20016-8017 (202) 885-2060

Access cable--the channels variously known as public, educational and governmental (or PEG) and offered as part of basic cable wherever they have been called for in franchises--is that rare site on cable where public interest comes before profit (Aufderheide, 1992). Its past is embattled; it was created in uphill struggles by local community activists, and survived only where constantly defended--in perhaps 15 percent of cable systems nationwide. The Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 (47 USC, 521-559), which dramatically reduced the power of local authorities to regulate through franchising and furthermore sapped access' funding mechanisms, weakened access' relationships with both local authorities and with cable companies.

Its present is no better. The Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992 did nothing to repair earlier damage and, indeed, added language that may complicate access' function further. One provision of the Act in fact could challenge the fundamental purpose of public access and rob it of its unique function within cable television: to permit speakers open access to the community of viewers without censorship. That provision says, first, that a cable operator may prohibit on PEG channels "obscene material, sexually explicit conduct, or material soliciting or promoting unlawful conduct." It also creates liability for cable operators in the case of obscene material (U.S. House of Representatives, 1992, 29).

Public access cable's free speech function is central to defining its social importance. Congress intended it to serve as "the video equivalent of the speaker's soap box or the electronic

parallel to the printed leaflet" (U.S. House of Representatives, 1984, 21-22). Public access' mandate is thus linked to the implications of the first amendment; it is a public forum, a facilitator of public conversation.

Public access is protected in the 1984 act, which requires cable operators to carry it without interference, making speakers responsible for their on speech. The Act provides for viewer control over potentially offensive material by mandating lockboxes or channel blocking options. However, public access' first-come first-serve, open access principle is complicated in practice, not least by the interest that local governments and cable companies have in the performance of these channels but also by practical questions of scheduling and handling demand on the service on the part of access managers (Meyerson, 1987-88, 189-91).

This study explores the social function of public access, as seen in programming that is or is seen as potentially controversial--the programming that could be in jeopardy with the 1992 Act. The study's objectives were to identify such programming and incidents of prohibiting such programming, and to estimate how editorial responsibility would alter the function and purpose of access, as perceived by access directors.

Some 31 access directors--chosen through their participation in the Alliance for Community Media, which represents the interests of cable access--were interviewed by telephone. Most (20) headed independent nonprofit entities; the rest were

functionaries of local government (9) or the cable company (2). The majority (21) came from smaller communities, while 10 worked in major cities or state capitals. The sample was regionally diverse, with 13 from the East, seven from the Midwest, three from the South, and eight from the West. Roughly speaking, this diversity was typical of the population of the Alliance, and probably of access nationwide (although this phenomenon is dispersed and localized enough to lack dependable national statistics).¹

The study was further bolstered by analysis of preliminary results of a mail survey asking the same questions, sent to access directors on the mailing list of the Alliance for Community Media. Among the 30 mail survey respondents, 21 headed nonprofit entities. Three centers were run by the city, and three by the cable company (two gave no information). Twenty-one were from smaller communities; nine were from major cities or state capitals. Thirteen came from the East, nine from the Midwest, one from the South, and seven from the West.²

PROGRAMMING THAT TESTS THE LIMITS

Access programming varies dramatically from locality to locality; what may be acceptable in Cambridge, MA is unimaginable in Defiance, OH or Olympia, WA. Access directors typically believe that if production usually reflects a concern somewhere in that community. "If it has an audience," said director Deb Vinsel in Olympia, WA, "it's part of your community, even if you wish it were not."

Public access often provides a unique venue in electronic media for unpopular opinions, minority viewpoints or expressions of minority culture. Access directors, when asked to consider recorded programming that a cautious programmer might reject for fear of being interpreted as containing "obscene material, sexually explicit conduct, or material soliciting or promoting unlawful conduct," almost universally cited several examples. These fell into several categories:

--sex education, particularly AIDS education. Series such as Fairfax (VA) Cable Access Corporation's Gay Fairfax, Grand Rapids (MI) Community Media Center's The Lambda Report, Tucson (AZ) Community Cable Corporation's Empty Closet would all be suspect for "sexually explicit conduct" related to AIDS education. So would be single programs such as Cambridge (MA) Community TV's Truth or Consequences: A Guide to Safe Sex at MIT, AIDS, a documentary cablecast at Spring Point Community television Center in South Portland, ME; and an AIDS prevention special involving role playing at Kalamazoo (MI) Community Access Center.

--health education. In Amherst (MA), a video of a home birth might have fallen under scrutiny. Desperately Seeking Susan, a program in Olympia, WA, hosted by a therapist, has featured delicate subjects, including one program on non-orgasmic women, with frank discussion of sexual behavior.

--opinions at the political margins, for potentially soliciting or promoting unlawful conduct. Libertarians,

anarchists, rightists and leftists all variously use cable access to promote political opinion slighted by gatekeepers in mainstream media. As well, passionate believers in particular political issues, such as abortion or homosexual rights, look to this venue.

For instance, in Grand Rapids producers of a regular series Lies of Our Times have at times endorsed sanctuary for Latin American refugees and encouraged blockades of government offices in protest of various official positions. In Sacramento, Libertarian Conspiracy producers, in accord with their minimalist approach to government, decry the criminalizing of marijuana. Tucson access center director Sam Behrend notes that both Libertarian Review and Time for Hemp, a regular series by supporters of legalization of marijuana, might become suspect programs; similarly a one-time program in Kalamazoo (MI), Cannabis, might not have run. A Fort Wayne late night weekly program, Ganymedian Slime Mold, produced by an idiosyncratic leftist, might not be acceptable simply for its unpredictability, according to access director Greg Vawter; another local program American Atheists might become suspect, he believes, simply for not conforming to mainstream behavior. In at least one case in a regular program in Portland, OR, a speaker recommended direct and illegal action to protect old timber growth.

Several access centers (Forest Park, OH; Fort Wayne, IN; Sacramento, CA; Kalamazoo, MI; Portland, OR; Dayton, OH; South Portland, ME) reported either local or imported programs opposing

abortion, some by Operation Rescue, which either encourage blocking of access to abortion clinics or include graphic, possibly offensive images or both. These programs would be suspect under a gatekeeping arrangement.

In Oregon during election season 1992, ballot measure 9, which would have criminalized some homosexual behavior, was hotly debated on access cable. Oregon access center directors in Portland and Salem both reported extensive use, both in live and taped programs, of access by opposing sides. Both sides incorporated material that might have been perceived as sexually explicit.

Another topical instance was the Gulf War, where access cable was a rare site of dissent, including a series of programs by Deep Dish TV, which packages programs for cable access and transmits them by satellite. This programming was typically controversial. For instance, in Winsted, CT, the Mad River TV access service weathered demands to remove anti-Gulf War programming while it was being cablecast. A production group in Portland, OR, The Flying Focus Video Collective, has taken controversial stands on issues ranging from the Gulf War to local environmental issues.

--programs reflecting the point of view of cultural minorities. For instance, young people eagerly use access cable both to speak to their own peers and to speak about an experience underrepresented in mainstream media. A program wildly popular with teenagers, Silly Goose, was for a season a weekly comedy

program in at least arguable and certainly adolescent taste in Defiance, OH. (Director Norm Compton recalled one episode that featured the theme of running with scissors.) Other regular local programs in that area that promoted youth culture on access were Musical Mayhem, featuring music videos, and Hard Hits, a rap show produced by a young African-American man. Similarly, in Olympia, WA, a youth-oriented music video program, Mosher's Mayhem, accounts for both a passionate teen audience and also the bulk of the occasional complaints to the service. In Grand Rapids, MI, Blackwatch focuses on the language and images of inner city youth. Malden, MA's public access has weathered controversy over youthful productions marked by vulgar language.

--programs that experiment with the form and otherwise stake a claim to art. Such programs have become controversial in Sacramento, Amherst, Davis, CA, Arlington, VA, and on Washington, D.C.'s DCTV system, and have been a perennial source of contention in public access.

In general, then, taped programming regularly appears on public access in ways that simultaneously serve the central mandate of the service and also offend some sensibilities.

LIVE PROGRAMMING

Live programming on public access reveals the social utility of potentially offensive programming in sometimes dramatic ways. Live programming can only be halted with a delay system beyond the budget of most access centers; it can only be dependably safe if both subject and participants can be counted on to avoid the

extremes of opinion that presently characterize public access.

Most centers surveyed offer live and interactive programming, and find it draws eager participation from viewers. Access center directors highlighted various kinds of programming, demonstrating the role of access cable as a public forum, which might be in jeopardy under a gatekeeping arrangement:

--sexual and health education. This is an area where live programming often draws an engaged, often young audience. In Chicago, AIDS Call-In Live receives phone calls four-fifths of which come from African-American youth, according to director Barbara Popovic. Typical of the kind of interchange was the phone call of one 17-year-old girl who wanted to know how to respond to a boyfriend who assured her they need not use condoms because he was "loyal" to her. The conversation was frank and colloquial on both sides, while also giving the girl much-needed information. As well, on air, speakers hold up items such as condoms and dental dams, and explain their use. On public access cable in Austin, TX, a program called Midnight Whispers frankly encourages viewers to call in to share their sexual fantasies, so that an on-air nurse can respond to them and discuss safe sex practices. The Portland, OR "AIDS Forum Live" similarly might raise concern. A Tucson program, Bridges, by and for the disabled, has featured AIDS education involving anatomical models. In Sacramento, the monthly "Health in America" program on alternative and holistic health options, has featured graphic images of women with mastectomies and damaged breast implants.

The director of the Defiance, OH, center (which also carries government and educational programming) even wonders what might happen to city council meetings if, for instance, anti-pornography groups appear.

--topical call-in programs. For instance, in Sacramento within hours of the Rodney King verdict a special edition of the weekly Live Wire community call-in program was airing, with scores of viewers, most apparently African-American, responding to a host known in the community for his success in working with alienated youth. Although the staff found that the discussion was less raw than expected, it was also a volatile moment. Programs such as Fort Wayne, IN's program Speak Out and Tucson's You're the Expert touch on controversial local issues ranging from street signs to police behavior, without any way of predicting how callers might behave. NDC Community TV in West St. Paul aired a series Facts not Friends around 1992 electoral politics, which the access director saw as expanding the debate. In South Portland, ME, during the Gulf War, participants suggested illegal actions as protest.

--minority cultures. The Fort Wayne, IN program Coalition for Unlearning Racism, a live twice-a-month program, deals with topics on which, as access manager Rick Hayes puts it, "people are already irate," and has been the site of heated discussion about racism. Hayes values it not because he thinks it changes the minds of extremists, but because public dialogue, including with extremists, educates the community. Also on the same system

is a program Message to the Black Man, a black nationalist program that purveys a distinctly minoritarian view in Fort Wayne. In Tucson, teenagers produce a live program called The Forbidden Zone, in which they talk in the slang and curse-laden jargon of their peers, involving sexually explicit language and sometimes addressing illegal activities such as drug use. It is also a rare public forum for this cohort; teenagers are far more likely to be the targets of mass media and advertisers' attention than they are to be producers. Similarly, the live teen show Active Butch/Pensive Willy in Newton Highlands, MA, has with its raw language in call-ins roused the ire of a board member.

Access directors often singled out live programming as of particular interest to their audience. "Live material like AIDS Call-in Live is what's best in access," said Chicago director Barbara Popovic. "If this can't be on, then it's the baby and the bathwater."

PRESCREENING AND BANNING PROGRAMMING

Most access centers surveyed do not prescreen at all, except, as in the case of Washington, D.C. and Dayton (OH) Access Television, a high speed run-through for technical quality. In fact, in one case, that of Somerville (MA) Community Access TV, the present community-run nonprofit began in response to outrage over the cable-run access center's prescreening of tapes. A few do prescreen, sampling programming for technical quality and content. In these cases (e.g., Prince George's Community Television, Landover, MD; Pittsburgh Community Television,

Pittsburgh, PA) estimates of time it now takes to do prescreening range from 10 to 18 hours a week; however, this prescreening is not currently done under the constraints of the new law.

Exceptions demonstrate a balancing of concern for family viewing hours with the service's open access policy. In Fairfax, VA, the center prescreens to decide on when to schedule. In Vail, CO, director Suzanne Silverthorn watches "anything that might be in question," while in Amherst Myra Lenburg looks at unsolicited material. Since this kind of prescreening does not need to be comprehensive, it is also a light administrative burden. In Olympia, WA, as in several other access centers including Somerville, there was no prescreening, but producers were given information on guidelines developed in conjunction with the city or cable operator, to place potentially offensive programs on late at night. Many access centers have guidelines and require producers to read guidelines and certify that they abide by them.

Public access directors do become adepts at dealing with complaints from viewers, and from city and cable officials. But rarely, in these interviews, had complaints resulted in prohibition of programming, and then usually after it had already run at least once.

Among several reported incidents of attempted programming intervention, two point up the importance of an independent public forum on controversial political issues. For instance, one Cincinnati channel accepted a tape from one political party

in 1991 local elections; the other party promptly obtained a restraining order, although it had the right to air a program, and furthermore center staff had volunteered to help produce one. Ultimately, the complaining party lost in court, and the tape was aired. In the small town of Defiance, Ohio, several years ago town officials attempted--again, unsuccessfully--to block a program criticizing the town's plan to privatize emergency medical services.

The two other reported cases involve questions of taste and decency. In Columbus, Ohio, in September 1992 the city, which controls transmission from the independent nonprofit center, responded to complaints about frontal nudity in a program on gays and AIDS by dropping the program after it had run. Upon legal consultation, however, the city reversed its decision because the program could not be considered pornography.

In an ongoing case in Sacramento, the incident appears part of a larger struggle between the center, the city, and the cable company. The cable company representative has seized upon a viewer complaint about a videoplay, Dinosaurs, and eagerly argued for shutting down the independently-run center to the city, which allocates its funds. Written and produced by a young local man, the play involved scenes of nudity and sexual aggression as part of the author's social critique. (The center's attorney advised the center the piece was not obscene.) Center director Ron Cooper recalls that the local cable operator, long a grudging supporter of the service, recently warned him that he would "shut

you down" and that he had the approval of the multi-system owner to take the case to court.

EXPANDING SPEECH

Calls for banning sometimes result in reasoned accommodation such as the guidelines devised by the aldermanic and cable boards in Somerville, MA. Those guidelines then are given directly to producers. Sometimes, they can act as a powerful threat. When a program by and for teenagers, Streetwatch, ran on Columbus Community Cable Access several years ago and frank sexual language offended city officials enough to pull the program from rotation briefly, the board was badly shaken. "When government taps you on the shoulder and tries to crush it at the same time, you take notice," recalled center director Carl Kucharski. He notes that several board members, whose corporations did business with the city, felt particularly vulnerable to official discontent. The board contemplated over a period of months ways to prescreen programming, but could not find a workable arrangement.

Currently access center directors confront controversy by encouraging more speech, not only by allowing all voices a hearing but also by encouraging complainants to make use of training and production assistance, and by explaining the philosophy of the access center. This process appears to expand the forum for speech, not only for producers but for viewers, who may call in.

At Malden (MA) Access TV, director Rika Welsh recalled a program made by local youths in summer 1992 with "what was to my taste and probably yours an excessive amount of profanity." After the program, the center scheduled a two hour call-in, which was vigorously used. For Welsh, "That's what public access is all about--creating that public space. It allows the community to speak to issues; it's not just about the programming itself."

At Waycross Community TV in Forest Park, Ohio, director Greg Vawter pointed to response to a racial hate text message posted on a nearby suburban system. Several of his access center's board members composed and aired passionate arguments against intolerance, part of a community-wide electronic conversation. Director Rick Hayes of the Fort Wayne, IN library system's public access channel noted that a well-established twice-weekly program, Coalition for Unlearning Racism, supported by the local NAACP and Urban League among others, began as a response to the possibility of carrying the Ku Klux Klan's Race and Reason (which never did run). Making the program also brought together nine groups that hitherto had not worked jointly.

COST OF PRESCREENING

The provisions on prohibition of programming and liability for obscene material in the 1992 Act would change the terms of PEG access dramatically. Implementing prohibitions such as the law now permits might involve, as the Federal Communications Commission has suggested (U.S. FCC. 1992, p. 7), certifications to the operator. These would seem to necessitate some kind of

prescreening or pre-emptive judgement on the safety of certain kinds of programming.

Aside from the question of mandate, in practical terms how would a requirement to certify and thus prescreen programming affect the current practice of access centers? Access center directors estimated typically that between a day a week and two fulltime staff jobs would be required to prescreen and assess programming for the channel. (Some systems generate more than 3,500 program hours a year.) All but one estimated it would delay programming. No directors suggested it was possible to increase budgets in a difficult economic period, and all suggested that the job would be done by someone at or near the top, usually themselves. Hap Haasch of Ann Arbor Community Access TV noted, "The real cost is not having staff available for almost a third of the work week."

The cost would thus be measured in terms of lost production assistance, training, and community outreach--in short, a crippling of the service itself. One director in Fitchburg, MA, called the time required "devastating to our already busy schedule."

In nine cases (Anderson Community TV, Cincinnati, OH; Winthrop, MA; Salina, KS; Holland, MI; Turner's Falls, MA; Ann Arbor, MI; Grand Rapids, MI; Fort Wayne, IN; Forest Park, OH; Glenview, IL) directors said they would probably have to drop all live programming. In others, such as Cincinnati Community Video, some live programming would be eliminated.

"There is not enough staff to supervise call-in lines or audio, control guests on programs or distinguish between 'safe' and 'dangerous' programs," wrote the director for Winthrop (MA) Community Access TV. Thus, he noted, programs of indisputable value might be lost. For instance, on October 30, 1991, when a terrible storm swept the area, the cable service provided seven hours of live coverage, giving information about street closings, flooding, evacuation routes and emergency shelters. Such programming, he suggested, would be eliminated along with all other live programming under certification or prescreening arrangements.

In Cincinnati, OH, Intercommunity Cable Regulatory Commission official Patricia Havlik said, "We'd probably have to drop the public access program--we can't afford to prescreen, we have no facilities or staff for it."

Access directors have evolved a variety of mechanisms to deal with first-amendment rights conflicts, which appear to have worked fairly well. The process has renewed their commitment to public access as a broad public forum, open even to repugnant speech. Several access directors, when asked to estimate the cost of implementing some screening process, initially refused to entertain the idea, responding with remarks like "I'd quit first," and "I'd go into another line of work." The access director for Mad River TV, of Winsted, CT, wrote in answer to a question about the cost of prescreening, "Impossible to budget--we just wouldn't do it." Their attitudes appear reinforced by

the record of broadly diverse programming that has a unique venue in public access.

The 1984 Act provides for viewers who reject such a forum. Lock boxes or the consumer option of blocking the channel was required by the Act, for access as well as for commercial channels, and would appear, from this survey, to be widely available. In the 31 interviews conducted, all but one person, who did not know, said the system had the capacity. In two cases, directors interviewed said that the company either appeared unwilling to block the channel or simply did not make public the ability to do so. In the 30 written surveys, 24 reported lockboxes available, although one said that they were not available for public access. By contrast, introducing editorial control over public access could, on the basis of access center directors' experience, violate the central concept of access cable.

NOTES

1. The following access directors, in alphabetical order, were interviewed by telephone: Sam Behrend, Tucson (AZ) Community Cable Corporation (November 13, 1992); Rick Bell, Tampa (FL) Cable TV (November 13, 1992); Joan Burke, Community Access Center (Kalamazoo, MI) (November 13, 1992); Alan Bushong, Capital Community TV (Salem, OR) (November 13, 1992); Mary Bennin Cardona, Glenview (IL) Television (November 13, 1992); Norm Compton, Defiance (OH) Community TV (November 17, 1992); Paul Congo, Austin (TX) Community TV (October 27, 1992); Ron Cooper, Access Sacramento (CA) (November 13, 1992); Neal Gosman, Cable Access St. Paul (October 23, 1992); Patricia Havlik, Intercommunity Cable Regulatory Commission (Cincinnati, OH) (November 13, 1992); Rick Hayes, All County Public Library Public Access (Fort Wayne, IN) (November 13, 1992); Irwin Hipsman, Cambridge (MA) Community TV (October 28, 1992); Dirk Koning, Grand Rapids (MI) Community Media Center (October 27, 1992); Carl Kucharski, Columbus (OH) Community Cable Access (October 22, 1992); Myra Lenburg, Amherst (MA) Community TV (November 20, 1992); Deb Luppold, Portland (OR) Cable Access TV (November 16, 1992); John Madding, Wadsworth (OH) Community TV (November 17, 1992); Paula Manley, Taulatin Valley (OR) Community Access (October 27, 1992); Fernando Moreno, City County Access TV (Albuquerque, NM) (October 27, 1992); Jeff Neidert, City of Brunswick, OH (November 18, 1992); Abigail Norman, Somerville (MA) Community Access TV (October 23, 1992); Barbara Popovic, Chicago Access Corporation (October 23, 1992); Tony Riddle, Minneapolis TV Network (October 23, 1992); Alex Quinn, Manhattan Neighborhood Network (October 23, 1992); Nantz Rickard, DC Public Access Corporation (Washington, DC) (October 28, 1992); Suzanne Silverthorn, Vail (CO) Valley Community TV (November 13, 1992); Fred Thomas, Fairfax (VA) Cable Access Corporation (October 27, 1992); Greg Vawter, Waycross community TV (Forest Park, OH) (November 13, 1992); Deb Vinsel, Thurston Community TV (Olympia, WA) (November 20, 1992); David Vogel, Community TV of Knoxville (TN) (October 27, 1992); Rika Welsh, Malden (MA) Access TV (October 28, 1992).

Access directors were asked these questions:

- 1) Do you or anyone else prescreen programming on public access for content or for technical reasons? If so, how does this affect programming, especially live programming? How much staff time does it take?
- 2) Does your system have the capacity to block channels or programs, or provide lockboxes?
- 3) Has anyone ever prohibited--or attempted to prohibit--someone from running a program on public access? What happened?
- 4) How much staff time do you think would it take to prescreen

NOTES

The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Tamar Rotem in administering the written survey.

1. The following access directors, in alphabetical order, were interviewed by telephone: Sam Behrend, Tucson (AZ) Community Cable Corporation (November 13, 1992); Rick Bell, Tampa (FL) Cable TV (November 13, 1992); Joan Burke, Community Access Center (Kalamazoo, MI) (November 13, 1992); Alan Bushong, Capital Community TV (Salem, OR) (November 13, 1992); Mary Bennin Cardona, Glenview (IL) Television (November 13, 1992); Norm Compton, Defiance (OH) Community TV (November 17, 1992); Paul Congo, Austin (TX) Community TV (October 27, 1992); Ron Cooper, Access Sacramento (CA) (November 13, 1992); Neal Gosman, Cable Access St. Paul (October 23, 1992); Patricia Havlik, Intercommunity Cable Regulatory Commission (Cincinnati, OH) (November 13, 1992); Rick Hayes, All County Public Library Public Access (Fort Wayne, IN) (November 13, 1992); Irwin Hipsman, Cambridge (MA) Community TV (October 28, 1992); Dirk Koning, Grand Rapids (MI) Community Media Center (October 27, 1992); Carl Kucharski, Columbus (OH) Community Cable Access (October 22, 1992); Myra Lenburg, Amherst (MA) Community TV (November 20, 1992); Deb Luppold, Portland (OR) Cable Access TV (November 16, 1992); John Madding, Wadsworth (OH) Community TV (November 17, 1992); Paula Manley, Tualatin Valley (OR) Community Access (October 27, 1992); Fernando Moreno, City County Access TV (Albuquerque, NM) (October 27, 1992); Jeff Neidert, City of Brunswick, OH (November 18, 1992); Abigail Norman, Somerville (MA) Community Access TV (October 23, 1992); Barbara Popovic, Chicago Access Corporation (October 23, 1992); Tony Riddle, Minneapolis TV Network (October 23, 1992); Alex Quinn, Manhattan Neighborhood Network (October 23, 1992); Nantz Rickard, DC Public Access Corporation (Washington, DC) (October 28, 1992); Suzanne Silverthorn, Vail (CO) Valley Community TV (November 13, 1992); Fred Thomas, Fairfax (VA) Cable Access Corporation (October 27, 1992); Greg Vawter, Waycross community TV (Forest Park, OH) (November 13, 1992); Deb Vinsel, Thurston Community TV (Olympia, WA) (November 20, 1992); David Vogel, Community TV of Knoxville (TN) (October 27, 1992); Rika Welsh, Malden (MA) Access TV (October 28, 1992).

Access directors were asked these questions:

- 1) Do you or anyone else prescreen programming on public access for content or for technical reasons? If so, how does this affect programming, especially live programming? How much staff time does it take?
- 2) Does your system have the capacity to block channels or programs, or provide lockboxes?
- 3) Has anyone ever prohibited--or attempted to prohibit--someone from running a program on public access? What happened?

4) How much staff time do you think would it take to prescreen programming on public access? What impact would it have on the budget? Would programming be delayed?

5) Do you have live programming now on public access? (Please give an example.) How do you think it would be affected if you were legally responsible for the programming, as you might become under some interpretations of the 1992 cable act?

6) If up till now you had been legally responsible for the programming on public access, is there a program(s) you might have considered not carrying, whether because of your own or board or city or cable company concern? Issues include sexual content, nudity, language or because it promotes unlawful conduct--for instance, gambling, civil disobedience, anti-abortion actions. (Could you include the title, a brief description, if possible when it was carried, and tell us briefly why you might not carry it...)

7) Has the cable operator issued any new rules or procedures as a result of the 1992 Act?

2. Surveys were sent out November 16 and those received by November 30 are alphabetized by town, township or county of origin: AACAT, Ann Arbor, MI; Arlington Community TV, Arlington, VA; Baltimore Cable Access Corp., Baltimore, MD; Bethel Park Public Access TV, Bethel Park, PA; Cincinnati Community Video, Cincinnati, OH; Anderson Community Television (Anderson Township), Cincinnati, OH; Davis Community TV, Davis CA; DATV, Dayton, OH; WFRN, Ferndale, MI; Fitchburg Access TV, Fitchburg, MA; College Cable Access Center, Fort Wayne, IN; Pubic Access Corp., Great Neck, NY; MCTV Gresham, Gresham, OR; HCTV, Holland, MI; Prince George's Community Television, Landover, MD; Nashoba Cable Community TV, Nashoba, MA; Newton Cable, Newton Highland, MA; Mid-Peninsula Access Corp, Palo Alto, CA; Pittsburgh Community Television, Pittsburgh, PA; Sierra Nevada Community Access TV, Reno, NV; Community Access TV of Salina Salina, KS; Saratoga Community Access TV, Saratoga, CA; Viacom Community TV, Seattle, WA; NDC-TV, St. Paul, MN; SPTV, South Portland, ME; Montague Community TV, Turners Falls, MA; Windsor, CT; Mad River TV, Winsted, CT; Winthrop Community Access TV, Winthrop, MA; Yakima Community TV, Yakima, WA.